

NORTHGATE STAKEHOLDERS GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

**North Seattle Community College
ED 2843A in the Dr. Peter Ku Education Building
Tuesday, April 20, 2004, 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm**

The Northgate Stakeholders Group (Group) held its second meeting at North Seattle Community College on Tuesday, April 20, 2004 from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm. The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Review and approve the summary of the first meeting;
- Provide informational presentations on the Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP) and development and stormwater concepts for the Northgate South Lot;
- Discuss and deliberate on South Lot stormwater concepts and CTIP scoping issues; and
- Discuss the upcoming community forum.

Welcome/Introductions/Updates

Welcome from Interim Chair Ron LaFayette

Ron LaFayette, President of North Seattle Community College, called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. He welcomed the Group to this second meeting and thanked those who participated in the bus tour, brown bag lunch, and other related events. He requested that Janet Way provide a brief update on the brown bag lunch hosted by Seattle Public Utilities (SPU). She reported that participants were given a very good overview of proposals for South Lot and got a preliminary look at the technical information, costs, and a comparison of the alternatives – information that all Group members had received at this meeting. [See notebook for an overview of the South Lot proposals discussed at the brown bag.]

President LaFayette reported that he had provided an update on the Group's work to the City Council, focused mainly on how the Group had been formed. He said that it was clear to him how important Northgate revitalization is to the City and how interested the City Council is in seeing how the Group's work proceeds.

Finally, he reminded everyone that the Group needed to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair and that he would be soliciting suggestions later in the meeting for a fair election process.

Agenda Review, Alice Shorett

Alice Shorett, facilitator, reviewed the meeting agenda. She pointed out that this meeting would provide the Group with its first opportunity to begin discussing and deliberating on the issues. She noted that the goal was to hear from all 22 seats during the discussions; she encouraged representatives and alternates to work out a method between themselves for allowing the alternates to speak.

Meeting Summary

The Chair announced that the first order of business was to adopt the summary of the first meeting. A Group member requested and made a motion that future summaries should identify speakers, not just the points that were made. Following a brief discussion on this issue, the motion was seconded but failed to win majority support. The summary from the first meeting was adopted in a unanimous vote. It will be posted on the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) webpage devoted to Northgate's revitalization.

Report and Updates from the City

Jackie Kim, Office of Policy and Development, gave a brief report on behalf of the City in response to a member's request at the first meeting for regular updates. Referring to a handout that the City prepared and handed out at this meeting, she reiterated the issues that had been laid out in the Northgate Framework Resolution and referred to a lot of other efforts that were underway to revitalize the area. (Please see the handout in member notebooks for the complete list; the handout is also available on the DPD's website.)

Introduction of Diane Sugimura, Director of the Department of Planning & Development

President LaFayette introduced Diane Sugimura, the Director of the department responsible for the organization and administration of the Stakeholders Group. She explained that she had been unable to attend the first meeting but appreciated the opportunity to meet the Group on the bus tour. She thanked Group members for their dedication and willingness to serve and said she was looking forward to reviewing their recommendations.

Informational Presentations and Discussions

South Lot Development (Lorig Proposal)

The Chair introduced Steve Bollinger from Lorig Associates who gave a brief update on the Northgate South Lot Development progress. He reported that Lorig had:

1. Selected an architect to work with -- Mithun.
2. Continued to work with SPU and the City to confirm that its development concepts work with the drainage options
3. Continued working on pedestrian and transit issues so they would be integrated into the development

4. Continued in a revolving process to identify potential retail clients, whose needs would have a big influence on the site.

Mr. Bollinger noted that pamphlets were available that addressed the basic issues and presented their proposed development concepts.

Concepts for South Lot Open Space and Natural Drainage

The Chair called upon SPU Director, Chuck Clarke and Miranda Maupin, SPU, to present the Northgate South Lot Open Space and Natural Drainage Options. Mr. Clark indicated that Ms. Maupin would first go through the technical team's results after which he would explain how SPU would use the information to make decisions and then ask for the Group's input on the alternatives to ensure that the City makes a good decision about the alternatives that should go forward.

Ms. Maupin presented information about the alternatives and the results of the technical analysis to date. The presentation included a brief overview of the options, a description of the evaluation method, the results of the technical team's analysis, and the benefit comparison process. (Presentation materials were sent to the Group in advance of the meeting and are available at the DPD Northgate website.)

Mr. Clarke then described SPU's process for evaluating alternatives. Instead of focusing primarily at costs (capital or capital plus operations and maintenance), he indicated that SPU now looks at the "value returned to the ratepayer," not just costs. For example, a higher environmental return or community acceptance could be significant in the evaluation of alternatives. He explained that it was very helpful to have a group of stakeholders to advise the city on community and environmental benefits. He also explained that threshold determinations related to whether or not an alternative contributed to flooding and its relationship to water quality were also important threshold determinations in SPU's evaluation process. He encouraged the Group to consider a 30, 50, or 100-year life cycle. He said that once the relative benefits of the alternatives were established, SPU would incorporate them into its analysis to determine the relative return to ratepayers.

Mr. Clarke also addressed the issue of why the City would make an investment in Northgate rather than elsewhere in the City. He said it came down to an opportunity cost. It made sense to take advantage of development that was underway and to make investments that would ultimately be needed rather than delaying the investment into the future.

Discussion and Deliberation on Open Space and Natural Drainage Options

President LaFayette prefaced the discussion by indicating that the Group did not need to make a decision on any one option at this meeting. Rather, it would be helpful to SPU to understand what it was that the Group valued in the different options and to identify additional information needed to help the Group arrive at a recommendation. He

requested that the Group review the benefits chart (sent out in advance) and think about the following three discussion questions:

1. What comments do you have about the Northgate South Lot Natural System Drainage and Open Space analysis? Is anything missing? Is it about right?
2. The “benefits comparison” chart identified criteria related to drainage, environmental and community benefits. Are there other criteria you think should be considered?
3. What one thing would you like the City Council to keep in mind when it reviews the drainage analysis results?

During the discussion, Group members requested the following **additional information**:

- What does the current system do (or not do) for water quality filtration and drainage? What additional benefits do each of the options provide in those areas?
- A glossary of terms assuming zero knowledge. Include information about how items have been used in other areas.
- A three-dimensional rendering or bird’s-eye view of all three options that would give a sense of how one would see and experience the area.
- The cost of cement retaining walls and how those costs impact the final cost of the project. What’s the best way to pay for it?

Group members also identified the following additional criteria to be considered (in addition to the criteria in the current Benefits Chart:

- Educational (referenced the tour of NSCC wetlands for student use)
- Visual
- Aesthetic
- Community buy-in (ranging from passion to acceptance)
- Cultural and recreational
- One member suggested giving a scoring method of values
- Include more extensive assessment criteria, including criteria used in other cases (referencing the Sheldon report as an example) such as ground water exchange, infiltration, natural biological support, and cultural and recreational values.

Additional questions included the following:

- How do you weigh the values of one option which makes water available only when it rains (natural drainage) vs. options which result in water all year (hybrid and daylight)?
- Which option stimulates development in the Urban Core?
- Which option gives the ratepayers the most bang for their buck? The analysis should consider if the option is a good use of resources.

- If the city has done an analysis of the state of the pipe that the creek is currently in, what is its condition?
- How will the three options relate to the redevelopment? How will it impact the final cost?

Several Group members expressed the opinion that anything was preferable to the asphalt now covering South Lot.

In response to a question, Lorig indicated that his firm could work with *any* of the three options.

In response to a question about the coordination between the Lorig development and South Lot drainage improvements, Mr. Clarke indicated that timing mattered. The sooner a decision was made, he said, the more cost effective it would be.

In response to a request for input from Group members who have been heavily invested in Thornton Creek issues, John Lombard indicated that the Thornton Creek Alliance was leaning strongly toward the hybrid option.

SPU invited interested members to a second “brown bag” event to hear the results of additional analysis on the drainage options. Later in the meeting, the date for this second meeting was set for April 27 in the late afternoon. SPU was to send out additional information about the location.

Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP)

Tony Mazzella, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), and Tom Noguchi, Mirai Associates, gave an informational presentation on “CTIP 101.” They reviewed the method for developing a coordinated transportation investment plan and cited examples of past projects. [See PowerPoint presentation materials provided in notebooks and available at the DPD website for details.]

A preliminary summary of the CTIP Stakeholder homework assignment was also distributed. This summary included the responses from the 17 members who turned in the transportation questionnaire. Members who had not yet sent in their questionnaires were requested to do so at their earliest convenience. A summary of the responses was to be available for discussion at the May 11 Stakeholders Group meeting.

CTIP Discussion and Deliberation

The Chair asked the Group to indicate additional information it needed to be able to offer advice on this issue. The Group requested the following information:

- What decisions are already final?
- What decisions are yet to be made that this group could influence?
- What assumptions are going into the model? For example:

- What is the assumption about how far people will be willing to walk?
- When will traffic counts be taken?
- With respect to the finding that traffic on roads in the Northgate area is “flat,” could that be a result of the fact that roads are already at capacity?

Barbara Maxwell said it was her understanding that the Northgate Framework resolution directed that CTIP should implement the policies and guidelines in the Northgate Area Comprehensive Plan. She handed out a 2-page synopsis of the transportation vision, policy and implementation guidelines in that document.

Urban Center and 5th Avenue Streetscape Update

Marty Curry, Executive Director of the Seattle Planning Commission, gave a brief report of the highlights from the April 11th pedestrian workshop. [See summary provided in the notebook materials and posted at the DPD website for details.] Ms. Curry said that the Planning Commission wanted the results to have an impact on the CTIP. She said it was important to identify what we want for the future, for example, being able to cross I-5 at Northgate. Even if this could not happen at present, she said, it should continue to be raised as a goal so that it might be realized in the future. She noted that there would be additional materials sent to Group members in preparation for discussions on this topic in early May.

Community Forum Format

Vicki King of Triangle Associates proposed a format for the May 13 Community Forum to the Group for its consideration. (The proposal was described on a handout available at the meeting.) The proposed approach was for the Stakeholders Group and the City to co-host a combined open house/public meeting. The roles of the Stakeholders would be to answer questions about the Stakeholders Group process, to describe the Group’s work to date on specific issues, and to hear the public’s input on the issues. The public meeting was proposed to be divided into thirds, so that adequate time would be available for the Group to hear from the public on all three issues (South Lot development concepts; South Lot drainage issues; and the scope of CTIP). In each third of the meeting, a panel of Group members would present the issue and the Group’s deliberations concerning the issue and invite public comment. Citizens would also be encouraged to offer written comments on all three issues.

The Group nominated the following stakeholders to serve on panels at the Community Forum:

- *Transportation:* Shaiza Damji, Barbara Maxwell, Shawn Olesen, and Ron Posthuma,
- *Drainage:* John Lombard, Kevin Wallace, and Janet Way
- *South Lot:* Janice Camp, Brad Larssen, and Gary Weber,

Election Process for a Chair and Vice-Chair

Pres. LaFayette reminded everyone that elections for the Chair and Vice-Chair positions would take place at the next meeting, May 11, 2004. After a brief discussion, it was decided that nominations for both positions should be sent to Vicki King of the Triangle facilitation team. All Stakeholder Group members were eligible for nomination, including self-nominations. It was agreed that a closed ballot would be distributed at the beginning of the May 11 meeting, with results tallied and announced at the end of the meeting. President LaFayette affirmed that the North Seattle Community College facilities would be available to the Group regardless of who was elected Chair.

Public Comment

Ron LaFayette opened the floor for public comment, calling on the two individuals who had signed up to speak.

Comment: Joel Tufel indicated that he was very frustrated at the lack of ability to comment during the meeting and the fact that citizens were given one minute at the end to comment, which was inadequate. He said he thought public comment should be incorporated earlier in the meeting, when the comments could influence the discussion, not just at the end.

Response: Ron LaFayette indicated that the Group's meeting had been focused on getting huge amounts of information. He indicated that the May 13 community forum was where the Group envisioned getting that public input.

Comment: Jan Brucker agreed with Mr. Toeffel. One minute at the end did not give citizens enough time to comment. She also requested the opportunity to be able to comment *during* the process. She indicated that it was important for the Group to hear from the people who had devoted passion to this over the years. On behalf of the Citizens of Livable Northgate, she offered to educate the Group about the Northgate Community Plan. The drainage plan design options, she said, would make a difference. She said she would like the opportunity, just like SPU, to contribute and present.

There was a brief discussion among Group members about the public comment process and the Chair suggested that this issue be addressed again in more detail at the next meeting. One of the Group members commented that he personally had listened to the public comments and that they had had a profound impact on his thinking. Additional suggestions for public interaction with the Group included submitting comment cards, position statements, providing suggestions to Group members between meetings, and joining the Northgate "interested parties" listserve. It was suggested that the facilitators solicit suggestions from Group members for how best to incorporate public comment into Group meetings and present the options at the next meeting.

President LaFayette adjourned the meeting at 7:15 pm.

Meeting Attendance

Representatives and Alternates of the **Northgate Stakeholders Group** in attendance were:

King County Metro: Rep. Ron Posthuma

Simon Properties: Rep. Gary Weber, Alt. Sam Stalin

Maple Leaf Community Council: Rep. Janice Camp

Licton Springs Community Council: Alt. Shannon Snider

Haller Lake Community Council: Rep. Velva Maye, Alt. Sue Geving

Pinehurst Community Council: Rep. Lorena Mrachek

Victory Heights Community Council: Rep. Brad Cummings

Northgate Chamber of Commerce: Rep. Shaiza Damji

Thornton Creek Alliance: Rep. John Lombard, Alt. Erik Davido

Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund: Rep. Janet Way, Alt. Bob Vreeland

North Seattle Community College: Rep. Ronald H. LaFayette, Alt. Bruce Kieser

Northwest Hospital: Rep. Chris Roth

Owners of Three or More Acres: Rep. Kevin Wallace, Alt. Rodney Russell

Senior Housing: Rep. Jeanne Hayden, Alt. Sandra Morgan

Renters/Condominium Owners: Rep. Debra Fulton, Alt. Brad Mason

Multi-family Housing Developers: Rep. Colleen Mills, Alt. Tom Donnelly

Businesses Inside the Mall: Rep. Kurt Schauermaann

Businesses Outside the Mall: Rep. Michelle Rupp, Alt. Dallas Carleton

Youth: Rep. Diana Medina

Labor: Rep. Brad Larssen, Alt. David Hellene

At-large: Rep. Shawn Olesen, Alt. Barbara Maxwell

At-large: Rep. Marilyn Firlotte, Alt. Mike Vincent

Members of the Triangle Associates facilitation team included: Alice Shorett, Vicki King, and Darcie Garland-Renn.